1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
9		
10	RUDOLPH LANGE, ) ) CASE NO. 1444 IGG	
11	Plaintiff, ) CASE NO. C08-1444-JCC	
12	V. )	
13	JOHN DEROUSSE, ) ORDER	
14	This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. No. 17).	
15	Plaintiff asks the Court to reconsider its previous Order (Dkt. No. 12) that dismissed the Snohomish	
16	Police Department and the Everett Police Department as defendants for failure to allege sufficient	
17	facts to identify a basis for municipal liability under Monell v. Department of Social Services, 436 U.	S.
18	658 (1978).	
19	The Local Rules provide:	
20	Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new	
21	facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.	
22	Local Rules W.D. Wash. CR 7(h).	
23	Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration shows neither manifest error nor new facts. Instead,	
24	Plaintiff merely asserts that his failure to identify a municipal "policy" or "custom" should be excused	l
25	a manufacture point, and and the familiary to received	-
26	ORDER	

because of his incarceration and limited access to the law library. (See Mot. 3 (Dkt. No. 17).) This is not a basis to reconsider a previous order. See Local Rules W.D. Wash. CR 7(h). Plaintiff may seek to cure the deficiencies in his second amended complaint through amendment, not by a motion for reconsideration. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion (Dkt. No. 17) is hereby DENIED. SO ORDERED this 12th day of May, 2009. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 

ORDER